

MEMORANDUM

TO: MLPA BRTF members
FROM: John Kirlin, Executive Director, MLPA Initiative
RE: Decisions made at BRTF meeting, March 14-15
DATE: March 17, 2006

This memo provides a summary of the actions taken at the BRTF meeting regarding packages of proposed MPAs for the central coast. We have reviewed written notes and the DVD record of the meeting to verify the accuracy of this memo. I have organized this chronologically, beginning with the packages as they existed when the meeting began March 14.

Packages under consideration as the meeting began

Six possible packages had been developed and presented by stakeholders, outside groups and the Initiative staff. Also included was Package 0, a “no project” alternative, which is the existing array of MPAs along the central coast.

- Package 0 - existing MPAs
- Package 1 - originally developed by consumptive users
- Package 2 - originally developed by conservationists
- Package 3 - developed by several CCRSG members as a package between packages 1 and 2
- Package S - developed by staff following our direction at the January 31-February 1, 2006, BRTF meeting
- Package AC - developed outside the CCRSG process, by NRDC and PBRO Conservation

One additional package (B, developed outside the CCRSG process by Help Our Peninsula Environment) had been dropped from further consideration at our January 31-February 1, 2006 meeting. That decision was based upon the recommendation of the Science Advisory Team and Initiative staff that it was not a required proposed network of MPAs.

The process preceding votes at the March meeting

- The BRTF received extensive and descriptive presentations on the packages by Initiative staff, evaluations by representatives of the SAT, comments by package proponents and public comments. This occurred from 10 a.m. to almost 7 p.m. on March 14.
- The BRTF returned March 15 to debate and adopt recommendations.
- The BRTF asked Initiative staff to work with proponents of Package 3 and SAT members to improve that package with elements of Package S. Those modifications were completed during a recess, reported to the BRTF and approved as Package 3R. (Ayes: Anderson, Caldwell, Golding, Isenberg, Reheis-Boyd, Wheeler)

Summary of BRTF Recommendations

The following recommendations were approved by the BRTF on March 15, 2006:

1. To forward as proposed alternative packages of MPAs for the Central Coast (vote of those present: 5-0):
 - Package 1
 - Package 2R (revised by BRTF vote)
 - Package 3R, (twice revised by the BRTF vote)
2. To recommend as the preferred alternative which the department will recommend to the commission (vote of those present: 3-2)¹
 - Package 3, as revised
3. To identify a number of issues of concern and recommendations to the department and commission, listed below
4. To forward, as information to the department, a number of comments on packages by individual BRTF members. These will be organized and forwarded to the department as informational items

Sequence of motions made and votes on packages to recommend to the DFG

First motion: To forward Packages 1, 2, and 3R to the Department of Fish and Game as alternative packages. A number of additional issues of concern were included in this motion. These are listed at the end of this memo.

Second motion: As a courtesy to Task Force Member Doug Wheeler, leaving for his flight, his preference was recorded: to forward Packages 1, 2, and 3R and to select Package 3R as the recommended preferred alternative.

Third motion: To move forward Packages 1, 2, and 3R and to select Package 2 as the recommended preferred alternative. This motion failed (Ayes: Caldwell, Golding; Nays: Anderson, Isenberg, Rehis-Boyd)

Fourth motion: To make the following changes in Package 3R: (incorporated into fifth motion, but initially a separate motion)

1. Enlarge the areas of three MPAs (at Point Sur, Point Buchon and Purisima Point to 18 square miles to meet the SAT "preferred" size range)

1. Note: Two BRTF members, Ms. Caldwell and Ms. Golding, preferred to recommend Package 2 as the preferred alternative. One BRTF member, Mr. Wheeler, had to leave at 2 p.m. on March 15. He recorded an affirmative vote on forwarding Packages 1, 2 and 3, and his preference for Package 3 as the preferred alternative. However, additional adjustments were made to Package 3 after he left the session.

2. To adopt the Package 2 boundary lines at Pinnacles/Stillwater Cove
3. To revise the configuration of MPAs along the bay side of Monterey Peninsula to: SMR from breakwater to Charthouse, then a SMCA, then SMR to Lovers Point, all with western boundary along 60 foot contour line.

Fifth motion: To forward Package 3R, as amended in the fourth motion, as the recommended preferred alternative. This motion passed (Ayes: Anderson, Isenberg, Reheis-Boyd; Nays: Caldwell, Golding)

Sixth motion: To forward Packages 1, 2, and 3R as amended. Motion passed unanimously.

Seventh motion: To incorporate into Package 2 the changes made to Package 3R in the breakwater to Lovers Point area. Motion passed (Ayes: Anderson, Caldwell, Golding, Reheis-Boyd; abstain: Isenberg)

Issues of Concern and Recommendations (identified only here; to be further described in materials forwarded to the department)

1. Kelp harvesting, including seasonal leasing and hand-harvesting
2. Vandenberg Air Force Base and the continuing discussion between the State and the USAF re: MPAs
3. Importance of funding for implementation of MPAs
4. Review and adjustment of fishing regulations to conform with MPA designation
5. Spear fishing and spear fishing contests (BRTF notes concerns expressed, but will not address)
6. Naming of MPAs should follow existing DFG practices and names submitted in packages carry no BRTF recommendation
7. Recommend Department care in adjusting boundaries for ease of understanding and enforcement, and attempt to limit both environmental and socio-economic impact by those changes
8. Extend boundaries close to state waters limit to that boundary
9. Recognize that activities on land can have negative impacts on marine habitats and life; though the MLPA Initiative did not have time to address this issue in developing packages of proposed MPAs, it urges the Commission and other responsible state agencies to address these impacts.